Questions from One-on-One Industry Meetings
26 Sep 01

1. **Question:** How does ETDS differ from OSP-2 and are ETDS missions considered in the OSP-2?
   Response: ETDS is an Army acquisition and it is inappropriate for RSLP to answer questions relating to that acquisition.

2. **Question:** Are there any firm missions under any of the proposed vehicle configurations?
   Response: No. However, according to RSLP's Program Management Directive (PMD) dated 10 Oct 01, RSLP serves as the DoD single point of contact for launch of deactivated Minuteman/Peacekeeper and other ballistic missile assets. RSLP maintains launch capability for deactivated Minuteman/Peacekeeper and other ballistic missile assets through storage and maintenance, aging surveillance, launch vehicle contracts, and maintaining necessary technical expertise of these assets.

3. **Question:** Do M-55 and 1st Stage PK motors have to be used in order to qualify as a vehicle under the developmental CLIN?
   Response: Yes. That was a conscious decision on the part of RSLP. Specifying either an M-55 or 1st stage PK motor provides clear delineation between this effort and other existing RSLP launch contracts (e.g., SRP-2).

4. **Question:** Will a CPIF CLIN be considered for those flights that are initial developments of a set configuration when that configuration has not previously flown?
   Response: Based upon industry input, we have changed our draft approach for the PK configurations. RSLP's current plan is to make the first flight for each PK configuration (PK TV and PK SV) cost plus incentive fee (CPIF). The production configurations (all flights after the first flight) will be FPIF.

5. **Question:** Are the OSP-2 ballistic missions limited exclusively to strategic-class downrange distances?
   Response: No.

6. **Question:** What is the basis for the mission model provided in the draft document?
   Response: A review of NMD, AFSPC, and potential space mission planning documents. This is a proposed ID/IQ effort where we only promise the guaranteed minimum. The mission model in the Industry Brief is for planning purposes only; the US Government does not promise the winning OSP-2 contractor(s) any of these missions.

7. **Question:** What are the payload masses, maximum RV diameters, and launch site/entry-point assumptions for the missions shown in the mission model?

Response: Reference the Technical Requirement Documents (TRDs) on the OSP2 website (www.te.plk.af.mil/contracts/contract.html). Please note that the PK TV TRD will be updated to specify the maximum payload diameter (unshrouded) as 3.3 meters.

8. **Question:** What are the vehicle configuration assumptions for the mission shown in the mission model? (3 Stage MM II, 3 Stage PK?)
   Response: There are no vehicle configuration assumptions in our model; the cartoons were used as visual markers of our Best Estimated Quantities (BEQs). Contractors may propose any stack configuration they see fit to meet the sample mission requirements in the TRDs.

9. **Question:** What is the availability of MM III stage (and GSE) assets? What is the deactivation plan?
   Response: RSLP does not plan on including MM III assets for this effort.

10. **Question:** What is the availability of PK stage (and GSE) assets? What is the deactivation plan?
    Response: PK stages 1-4 will be available as GFP upon deactivation. The first three stages will be refurbished by the Government and provided as flight worthy GFP. The RSLP deactivation plan is under development.

11. **Question:** What is the deactivation and servicing plan for the PK 4th stage? To what degree is that GFP? Is there a possibility of the government de-tanking this stage?
    Response: Fourth-stages will be available as GFP minus the Missile Guidance and Control System. There are no plans to de-tank these stages. Refurbishment and flight-worthiness will be the Contractor's responsibility. We also plan to keep a certain number of fourth-stage structures without any of the internal components, which will also be available as GFP.

12. **Question:** Is there any consideration or need for air or sea-launched ballistic missions?
    Response: There is neither an air nor a sea launch requirement for this acquisition. Should these requirements materialize, they would be put on some other contract(s).

13. **Question:** Is there any consideration or need for suborbital or orbital launches from Kodiak? If so, will new pad be built?
    Response: Both types of launches may be required from Kodiak. A launch from Kodiak will be considered under an enhancement CLIN. The government will handle treaty compliance issues and the building of new launch pads if required. Contractor will still be accountable for GSE.

14. **Question:** A new aboveground launch pad is desirable for PK suborbital launches, will SMC address the need to add the site to the START treaty issue?
    Response: There are already two, above ground, treaty declared space launch facilities at Vandenberg AFB. Any new PK launch site would need to be treaty

declared, which would take approximately six months. This has been done previously and treaty compliance issues will be handled by RSLP.

15. **Question:** What launch pads are being made available as GFP?
Response: Launch facilities for VAFB will be provided (assumed baseline), as well as Kodiak, which will be an enhancement. However, the Government reserves the right to launch out of different launch sites, where we will negotiate the cost difference with the OSP2 awardee(s).

16. **Question:** Is launch site facilitation a CPIF CLIN?
Response: No. We expect the system to be modular enough to be transportable between facilities.

17. **Question:** To what extent is Air Force assembly, integration, and emplacement of MM and PK stages available as GFP, versus to be performed by the launch service provider?
Response:

a. MM: The Air Force will integrate the Minuteman motors into a booster assembly and transport it to the launch base. For silo launches, the Government will transport the booster assembly to the silo and emplace it. For pad launches, a modified Transporter/Erector (TE) will be provided by the Government that will allow break over at the pad. The Contractor will be responsible for transporting the booster assembly to the pad and emplacing it.

b. PK: The AF will deliver the PK stages to the launch site and provide available PK handling equipment for transport to the launch pad and assembly by the Contractor.

18. **Question:** Will an OSP GFP asset list be made available?
Response: Yes. A draft list will be posted in the Bidder's Library on the Det 12 web page. This list will be formalized at the time of RFP release.

19. **Question:** What PK assets are available as GFP to aid in development risk mitigation (e.g., flight hardware available as engineering development units)?
Response: All PK missile components except the Missile Guidance and Control System (MGCS) will be made available.

20. **Question:** Is a system-level (front section) vibration test required (and to what levels)?
Response: Yes. Vibration levels should be sufficient to verify workmanship.

21. **Question:** What is the basis for the 6600-lbm payload weight for the PK 3-stage suborbital mission?
Response: This number represents current mission models of Single RV, full up PK stacks that may support NMD missions.

22. **Question:** Are the anticipated orbital launch missions to be exclusively servicing USG payloads?
    Response: Yes.

23. **Question:** What is the basis for assuming that there are START issues with use of the PK 4th stage for axial thrust?
    Response: There are no issues concerning the 4th stage under the current START Treaty. We have changed our position to allow the use of a 4th stage for axial thrust and the TRD will be changed accordingly.

24. **Question:** What is the rationale for FPIF on PK launches?
    Response: Based upon industry input, we have changed our draft approach for the PK configurations. We now plan on making the first flight for each PK configuration (PK TV and PK SV) cost plus fixed fee. The production configurations (all flights after the first flight) will be FPIF.

25. **Question:** Will Air Force take care of the Space Ports?
    Response: Yes.

26. **Question:** Will the Air Force provide the proper mass numbers for the PK vehicle?
    Response: Yes. This information will be made available upon request. Contact Martin Baca at 505.853.6690 for any requested information that is not included within the electronic bidder's library.

27. **Question:** How much will the delay cost matrix account for in the evaluation?
    Response: The details of how the Government will evaluate any proposals will be listed in the RFP. RSLP has not determined the specific evaluation at this time and is still receiving industry input.

28. **Question:** What is our justification for not wanting to provide indemnification?
    Response: In accordance with Public Law 85-804 and Executive Order (EO) 10789, indemnification is appropriate when a contractor is exposed to risks which are unusually hazardous or nuclear in nature and for which insurance coverage is not available at a reasonable cost. We in RSLP acknowledge that working with rocket motors is unusually hazardous; however, we believe that insurance coverage is available at reasonable rates. This has been evidenced by the current Sounding Rocket Program (SRP-2) launch contract where indemnification was not provided. The risks for OSP2 are very similar to those on the SRP-2 acquisition. Additionally, the Air Force takes possession of the rocket (DD 250 signed) at T +1.